

**DOCKET NO.:** Polaroid 8522 (IVBA-0331)  
**Application No.:** 10/023,245  
**Office Action Dated:** November 2, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 24 are pending in this application and stand finally rejected. Claims 25 to 30 were previously cancelled. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the following remarks.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

#### ***Claims 1 to 10, 13 to 18, and 21 to 24***

Claims 1 to 10, 13 to 18, and 21 to 24 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0078160 (“Kemp application”) in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0113994 (“Smith application”).

Applicants submit that it has not been established in the Office Action that the claimed invention is *prima facie* obvious. To establish a proper *prima facie* rejection, the following elements must be shown:

- (1) the reference(s) is (are) available as prior art against the claimed invention;
- (2) the motivation (explicit or implicit) provided by the reference(s) that would have rendered the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention;
- (3) a reasonable expectation of success;
- (4) the basis for concluding that the claimed invention would have been obvious to do, not merely obvious to try; and
- (5) the reference(s) teach(es) the claimed invention as a whole.

Applicants submit that elements 2, 3, 4 and 5 have not been established. Hence, a *prima facie* obviousness rejection is improper. *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Applicants traverse the rejection because the Kemp application does not disclose the two required separate and distinct data types and the Smith application does

not supply these missing limitations. Even if the two references were properly combinable, and applicants are not conceding the propriety of doing so, the combined disclosures would not achieve applicants' claimed method or system.

The method of claim 1 and its dependent claims and the system of claim 15 and its dependent claims involve two types of data:

1. data necessary to *provide the service* being processed (for example, information to fulfill the service request such as an event ticket, coupon, image, or a compound document); and
2. data required for the service (which is used to generate input data for the specific printer designated by the user to render the *permanent record of the service*);

The first data type is handled at the service provider where the service is completed. The second data type is utilized by the service provider to provide a permanent record of the service (like a receipt), which is printed at a printer of the user's choosing.

Applicants submit that the Kemp application does not disclose, teach, or suggest the second data type that is a required limitation of all of the pending claims. The Kemp application discloses a remote printing service where a user sends a file to the remote printing service provider over a data network, who in turn prints the file at its print shop for later pick-up by or delivery to the user. No mention is made with respect to a permanent record of this printing service that is transmitted to a remote printer that is chosen by the user.

The Office recognizes this deficiency and turns to the Smith application to remedy the deficiency. However, the Smith application fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the second data type. Rather, the Smith application only discloses a portable device that prints by transferring print information to a remote printer via the web. In the claimed method and system, the user operated communications device transmits two types of data – the first to request the required service from the remote service provide and the second to provide instructions to the service provider regarding where the permanent record of the transaction should be printed. The Smith application only discloses sending print information over the

**DOCKET NO.:** Polaroid 8522 (IVBA-0331)  
**Application No.:** 10/023,245  
**Office Action Dated:** November 2, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

web to a remote printer; it does not contemplate a device that transmits data regarding where the user wants the permanent record of the transaction rendered to a service provider, who in turn carries out these requested instructions.

On page 3 of the final rejection, the Office attempts to show that there is user control of the printing. However, the information that the Office references in the Kemp application is directed to details of the requested service (where the requested service is a print job), *i.e.*, the first type of data. Even the special processing that may be requested by the user and which the Office implies may be the second type of data actually refers to the requested service not to the permanent record or receipt of the transaction itself.

Applicants submit that the Office has applied an “obvious to try” standard rather than a proper obvious standard. Furthermore, applicants submit that it is impermissible for the Office to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or “template” to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The Office cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Kemp application itself is silent with respect to the printing of the second type of data, namely, printing of a permanent record of the transaction at a user designated remote printer. The Office has not pointed to any motivation in the reference itself or in combination with the Smith application that would teach or suggest printing of a permanent record of the transaction at a user designated remote printer. Applicants submit that the Office is engaging in the impermissible hindsight construction of the applicants’ claimed invention and is not applying the correct test for obviousness.

In view of the foregoing arguments, applicants submit that the Office has failed to establish a proper *prima facie* obviousness rejection and, therefore, requests the Office to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 to 10, 13 to 18, and 21 to 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Kemp application in view of the Smith application.

**DOCKET NO.:** Polaroid 8522 (IVBA-0331)  
**Application No.:** 10/023,245  
**Office Action Dated:** November 2, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

***Claims 11, 12, 19, and 20***

Claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over the Kemp application in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0100802 (“Sehr application”) in further view of the Smith application. Applicants traverse the rejection because the Sehr application does not remedy the deficiency in the combination of the Kemp and Smith applications.

Claims 11 and 12 are dependent on claim 1 and recite the method wherein the requested service is an event ticket or coupon, respectively. Likewise, claims 19 and 20 are dependent of claim 15 and recite the system wherein the requested service is an event ticket or coupon, respectively.

The Office relies on the Sehr application because it discloses providing an event ticket service or redeemable points in a card, accordingly to supply the event ticket or coupon missing from the Kemp application. However, the Sehr application is also silent with respect to the printing of the second type of data, namely, printing of a permanent record of the transaction at a user designated remote printer. Accordingly, the combination of the Sehr, Kemp, and Smith applications does not achieve applicants’ claimed method or system.

In view of the foregoing arguments, applicants submit that the Office has failed to establish a proper *prima facie* obviousness rejection and, therefore, requests the Office to withdraw the rejection of claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Kemp application in view of the Sehr application in further view of the Smith application.

**DOCKET NO.:** Polaroid 8522 (IVBA-0331)  
**Application No.:** 10/023,245  
**Office Action Dated:** November 2, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

**Conclusions**

Applicants request:

- (1) reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims; and
- (2) allowance of claims 1 to 24.

If the Examiner is of a contrary view, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (404) 459-5642.

Date: May 2, 2007

/Wendy A. Choi/  
Wendy A. Choi  
Registration No. 36,697

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439